REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 23, 2008. A petition to revive this application has been filed.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were objected to for informalities. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 2002/0021052 to Asao. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,535 to Oohashi et al. Claims 4-5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,072 to Armiroli et al. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao in view of Fudono et al. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,747,913 to Amlee et al. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aaso in view of U.S. 2003/0137214 to Ishizuka et al. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao in view of U.S. 2002/0096965 to Ikeda et al.

In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to add standard headings and to delete reference to the claims.

Regarding the objections to the claims set forth on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to change interstices (90) to "(56)" to conform to Fig. 2a.

The point P and tangent T are shown in Fig. 5. Fig. 5 shows an arrow designated as $L_M P$ on the point P. The horizontal line shown in Fig. 5, which has not been designated as the tangent T, leads simultaneously through this point P.

The Examiner further objected that the center portion m is unclear since there is no clear definition of where m is starting. Page 9, from line 1 of the specification describes that the chamfer 68 has a center M, which divides this element with regard to the length in the center. The center portion m is arranged symmetrically to the center M. This means that the remaining longitudinal sections on both sides of the center portion m are the same size. The center portion m and the two lateral edge sections therefore form the entire length l of the chamfer 68. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the question as to where the center M begins is disclosed and answered.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 3, 8, 9 and 11 by Asao, the Applicants respectfully submit that the features of claim 1 are not disclosed by this reference. Before a comparison of the features is made in detail, however, it should be noted that the manner in which the last feature of claim 1 is interpreted with regard to Asao is not correct. The angle α of 22° is not measured according to the claimed feature of claim 1.

The last feature of claim 1 defines that in the plane perpendicular to the pivot axis 65 between the tangent T and the chamfer 68, an angle of inclination α is formed which has a size of between 15° and 25°. According to this definition, the angle of inclination α essentially lines in a plane which is oriented perpendicular to the pivot axis 65. In this plane, according to this definition, the

angle between the tangent T and the chamfer 68 is determined, In Fig. 7 of Asao, however, a spatial view of a portion of the pole core 51 is shown, which also is shown in Fig. 1 in mounted form in a rotor (pole core member 51). The specific type of angle that is defined in claim 1 cannot be determined from a completely undefined representation with regard to the position and orientation of a spatial object, as is the case in Fig. 7. The conclusion is incorrect *per se*.

Attached hereto for facilitating the present argument is a representation of a cylindrical body in plane view on the circular surface ("cylinder, front view, View 1"). Also attached is a side view on the same cylinder ("cylinder, side view, View 2"). The left side of this figure shows a point P, which is defined by a diameter line, which intersects the circumference. A tangent T is inscribed by this point P; an angle is formed between the tangent T and its axis S. This angle α has the defined value of 45°. By tipping of this spatial object in the side view (see also the same sheet, right side), the angle α appears to be 0°. However, the angle α is clearly defined (see also last feature of claim 1) as an angle of inclination which is in a plane perpendicular to the axis of rotation between the tangent T and the chamfer 68. In this principle sketch ("cylinder, front view, View 1"), like the definition in claim 1, the tangent T and the axis S forms the angle $\alpha = 45°$, whereby this angle $\alpha = 45°$ is disposed in the plane which is perpendicular to the pivot axis shown in the left of the figure as a point.

In the right portion of the figure, the pivot axis is shown as a line, which here is shown as a double arrow. The tangent T and the axis S merge onto one another in this view, so that no angle can be measured between them. In other

words, α here would be 0°. However, this is not the angle that is required as defined in claim 1, last feature. The angle considered from Fig. 7, accordingly, is much too small to compare with the angle which actually must be measured in Asao. In other words, the last feature of claim 1 apparently shown in Fig. 7 is definitely not shown by this reference.

If the cylinder according to the attached illustration is considered in an angle of 45° on the uppermost edge (sheet 2 of 2), then one recognizes according to the illustration "cylinder view 3" (45°) that the point P "slides" on to the point P'. The angle α, formerly 45°, is then a smaller angle, approximately 35°. Since Fig. 7 definitely shows the pole wheel 51 in the spatial view, which lies between the positions "cylinder front view" and "cylinder side view", it is therefore clearly shown that the angle allegedly shown in Fig. 7 in realty CANNOT be 22°.

Asao shows a claw pole rotor for an electrical machine, in particular an alternator, which has two pole wheels 51, 52, which carry claw poles 53, 54 with respective pole roots originating from a plate region, whereby on a circumference of the claw pole rotor, claw poles 53, 53 of the role wheels 51, 52 are disposed alternating and between interstices of the claw poles 53, 54. At this point, it should be noted that claim 1 contains a translation error that has been corrected ("and located between the claw poles or interstices...").

In addition, Asao discloses that a claw pole has a radial outermost-diameter surface 100, which is determined by a pivot axis (axis of shaft 6), whereby a chamfer extends on the one hand in a circumferential direction and on

the other hand in an edge direction of a claw pole. The chamfer 101 (inclined surface) has a center portion in the edge direction, which intersects the transition plane defining the pole root and the freely projecting part of the claw pole. This transition plane can be seen for example in Fig. 13.

There, a field coil 13 is shown as a conventionally described embodiment, which is limited right and left, that is, in a pivot direction, by two surfaces. These surfaces represent a transition plane as defined in claim 1. The chamfer 101 likewise has a center portion m, which can be over 8/10 of the length of the chamfer length oriented n the edge direction. The claw poles in addition have a width B_K oriented in the circumferential direction and a half width B_K on the cylindrical surface in a plane of the claw pole 53, 54 perpendicular to the pivot axis. This perpendicular plane through the claw pole defines a point P at the point of the half width B_K. In this point, likewise, a tangent T is inscribable. As set forth above, the last feature of claim 1 is not disclosed by Asao, which defines that in the plane perpendicular to the pivot axis between the tangent T and the chamfer 1012, an angle of inclination α is formed, which is between 15° and 25°.

The claim 1, therefore, is neither anticipated by nor made obvious over the Asao reference. Likewise, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would

very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700